REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 131-286 remain in this application. Claims 131, 144, 157, 170, 183, 196, 209, 222, 235, 248, 261, and 274 have been amended.

II. INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Applicant will resubmit the information disclosure statements that the Office Action cited.

III. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected Claims 131-136, 139-141, 143-149, 152-154, 156-162, 165-167, 178-180, 182-188, 191-193, 195-201, 204-206, 208-214, 217-219, 221-227, 230-232, 234-240, 243-245, 247-253, 256-258, 260-266, 269-271, 273-279, 282-284 and 286 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura et al. (US 5,719,982) and Wagner (US 5,600,379). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 131 has been amended to clarify the claimed invention and appears as follows:

131. A method for storage and display of multimedia data, comprising the steps of:
concurrently receiving at least two digital television streams;
extracting from the at least two digital television streams, MPEG streams that contain a plurality of video frames and time stamps associated with the video frames;
identifying starting locations of video frames within the MPEG streams and time stamps associated with video frames;
concurrently storing on a storage device the MPEG streams, starting locations of video frames within the MPEG streams and time stamps associated with the video frames, the storage device additionally containing a plurality of previously stored MPEG

streams, starting locations of video frames within each of the previously stored MPEG streams and time stamps associated with the video frames within each of the previously stored MPEG streams;

accepting a user control command;

in response to the user control command, selecting a particular video frame from within a particular MPEG stream stored on the storage device using a time stamp associated with the selected particular video frame;

retrieving the selected particular video frame using a stored starting location of the selected particular video frame; and

sending the selected particular video frame for display.

The Office Action states "… it is noted that the device disclosed by Kawamura can be used to repeat the recoding process of many MPEG streams and their associated information as described in (2) and (3) into the recording medium. … In other words, Kawamura clearly discloses 'the storage device additionally containing a plurality of previously stored MPEG streams, staring locations of video frames within each of the previously stored MPEG streams and time stamps associated with the video frames within each of the previously stored MPEG streams." However, there is no support of such a statement in Kawamura.

Nevertheless, Kawamura does not teach or disclose extracting from the at least two digital television streams MPEG streams that contain a plurality of video frames and time stamps associated with the video frames, identifying starting locations of video frames within the MPEG streams and time stamps associated with video frames, and concurrently storing on a storage device the MPEG streams, starting locations of video frames within the MPEG streams and time stamps associated with the video frames, the storage device additionally containing a plurality of previously stored MPEG streams, starting locations of video frames within each of the previously stored MPEG streams and time stamps associated with the video frames within each of the previously stored MPEG streams as cited in Claim 131. Kawamura's disclosure does not contemplate such

features as Kawamura's disclosure of encoders teaches away from the claimed invention by teaching that an optical disc which is a linear storage is used to store modulated data. Kawamura does not contemplate extraction of MPEG streams from at least two digital television streams and concurrent storage of the MPEG streams. Therefore, Kawamura does not teach or disclose what is cited in Claim 131.

Further, Wagner does not teach or disclose concurrently receiving at least two digital television streams as cited in Claim 131.

Therefore, Kawamura in view of Wagner does not teach or disclose the invention as claimed.

Claim 131 is allowable. Independent Claims 144, 183, 196, 235, and 248 are similarly allowable. Claims 132-136, 139-141, 143, and 145-149, 152-154, 156, and 184-188, 191-193, 195, and 197-201, 204-206, 208, and 236-240, 243-245, 247, and 249-253, 256-258, 260 are dependent upon Claims 131, 144, 183, 196, 235, and 248, respectively, and are allowable.

Applicant would like to comment on a few of the Office Action's statements.

With respect to Claims 135, 139, and 140, the Office Action points to col. 11, lines 40-67 which states:

> "One feature of the present invention is the time code interpolating circuit 42 that interpolates time codes that are intermittently supplied thereto so as to generate successive time codes. The header separating circuit 22 separates a time code (TC) from a GOP header and supplies the separated time code to the time code interpolating circuit 42 which outputs the time code (TC) for a picture at the beginning of the GOP. For a picture not at the beginning of GOP, the time code interpolating circuit 42 outputs an incremented value (in the normal reproduction mode) or a decremented value (in the reverse reproduction mode) as an interpolated time code, thereby generating time codes for every picture in the GOP.
>
> FIG. 17 shows the relation between the pictures in a GOP and the time codes in accordance with the present invention. For the first picture I.sub.0 of a particular GOP, the time code (0h01m02s01f) that has been designated in the encoding

> process is obtained from the GOP header (where h represents hour, m represents minute, s represents second, and f represents frame). The next picture B.sub.0 was not assigned a time code by the encoding process. Thus, the time code interpolating circuit 42 generates the interpolated time code (0h01m02s02f) for the picture B.sub.0. In the same manner, the time code interpolating circuit 42 successively generates interpolated time codes for the remaining pictures belonging to the same GOP as picture I.sub.0. Consequently, the time code interpolating circuit 42 eventually generates the time code (0h01m02s16f) which, it is appreciated, happens to be"

Kawamura does not teach or suggest any of the elements in Claims 135, 139, and 140. There is no mention of wherein the selecting step substitutes a second storage device for the storage device and selects a particular video frame from within a particular MPEG stream stored on the second storage device using a time stamp associated with the selected particular video frame or switching to a second storage device for MPEG stream storage or switching to a second digital television stream as cited in these claims.

With respect to Claim 136, Kawamura does not teach or disclose wherein the extracting step extracts an MPEG stream based on a user control command as cited in the claim. Col. 3, lines 56-67 make no mention of such a feature.

With respect to Claim 141, Kawamura makes no mention of such features. Col. 12, line 66 to col. 13, line 10 do not disclose such features.

With respect to Claim 144, Applicant would like to point out that the Office Action states that Kawamura discloses the claimed audio frame, however, col. 3, lines 47-51 merely state:

> "FIG. 7 shows another example of encoding apparatus. In FIG. 7, an input video signal and an input audio signal are supplied to a video encoder 1 and an audio encoder 2, respectively. The compressed and encoded video and audio data are then supplied to the multiplexing unit 13."

Kawamura does not disclose selecting a corresponding audio frame from within the particular MPEG stream that corresponds to the particular video frame and retrieving

the selected corresponding audio frame from the particular MPEG stream as cited in Claim 144.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

IV. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected Claims 137, 142, 150, 155, 163, 168, 176, 181, 189, 194, 202, 207, 215, 220, 228, 233, 241, 246, 254, 259, 267, 272, 280, and 285 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura et al. (US 5,719,982) and Wagner (US 5,600,379) as applied to claims 131-136, 139-141, 143-149, 152-154, 156-162, 165-167, 178-180, 182-188, 191-193, 195-201, 204-206, 208-214, 217-219, 221-227, 230-232, 234-240, 243-245, 247-253, 256-258, 260,266, 269-271, 273-279, 282-284 and 286 above, and in further view of Logan et al. (Re. 36,801). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is deemed moot in view of Applicant's comments regarding Claims 131, 144, 157, 170, 183, 196, 209, 222, 235, 248, 261, and 274, above. Claims 137, 142, and 150, 155, and 163, 168, and 176, 181, and 189, 194, and 202, 207, and 215, 220, and 228, 233, and 241, 246, and 254, 259, and 267, 272, and 280, 285 are dependent upon Claims 131, 144, 157, 170, 183, 196, 209, 222, 235, 248, 261, and 274, respectively, and are allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

V. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected Claims 138, 151, 164, 177, 190, 203, 216, 229, 242, 255, 268, and 281 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura et al. (US 5,719,982) and Wagner (US 5,600,379) as applied to claims 131-136, 139-141, 143-149, 152-154, 156-162, 165-167, 178-180, 182-188, 191-193, 195-201, 204-206, 208-214, 217-219, 221-227, 230-232, 234-240, 243-245, 247-253, 256-258, 260-266, 269-271, 273-279, 282-284 and 286 above, and in further view of Yuen et al. (US 5,488,409). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is deemed moot in view of Applicant's comments regarding Claims 131, 144, 157, 170, 183, 196, 209, 222, 235, 248, 261, and 274, above. Claims 138, and 151, and 164, and 177, and 190, and 203, and 216, and 229, and 242, and 255, and 268, and 281 are dependent upon Claims 131, 144, 157, 170, 183, 196, 209, 222, 235, 248, 261, and 274, respectively, and are allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

VI. MISCELLANEOUS

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

The Applicants believe that all issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed and that allowance of the pending claims is appropriate. Entry of the amendments herein and further examination on the merits are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (408) 414-1080 ext. 214 to discuss any issue that may advance prosecution.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee that may be due in connection with this Reply to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: December 19, 2007

/KirkDWong#43284/

Kirk D. Wong
Reg. No. 43,284

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext. 214
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076